IMC Meeting Minutes: 04-21-2006

Minutes transcribed by Lauren Latterman – OIT, Elain Radford – OIT.

I.   Call to Order: 1:32 pm – Chairman Picanso

IMC Commissioner attendance: Coleman, Delmonico, Malinowski, McGimpsey, Monkman, Mulford, Picanso, Pommer and Rippy.

Introduction of Commissioners and audience members.

A. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Picanso formally recognized the efforts of Jennifer Larsen, OSPB, who had been helping the IMC and OIT over the last few months. Jennifer was presented with a Certificate of Appreciation as well as thank you letter, signed by Chairman Picanso. Jennifer will be leaving the Commission to focus on her intiatives with OSPB.

Chairman Picanso provided an update of the status of current legislation: SB-063, SB-063, SB-149, HB-1157. Chairman Picanso asked Representative Coleman to provide an update on her bill, HB-1157. Representative Coleman provided a brief overview of the legislation commenting that they are trying to "get our hands around Cyber Security", trying to improve procurement and reorganize the IMC/OIT.

B. Meeting Minutes

Chairman Picanso opened the floor for discussion on the March 17, 2006 IMC Meeting. No discussion followed.

Motion	(Motion: Commissioner Malinowski, 2nd: Representative Coleman)

To approve the meeting minutes for March 17, 2006 IMC meeting.
Approved unanimously.

Chairman Picanso noted that all IMC documents will be available on the OIT website in a few weeks, once the new website is up and running.

C. Motions and Action Items

Chairman Picanso called forward Arlene Booker, OIT staff, who provided the Commission with a review of the March 17, 2006 Motions and Action Items list, and facilitated the following discussion:

Arlene reported that the minutes from the February 17, 2006 IMC meeting and the PM Common Methodology v.1.0 were adopted. She further noted that the vote regarding the PM Common Methodology v.1.0 allows for updates to be added as needed.

Action Item #1. Arlene reported this item may be completed: there will be more information on this by the end of the day.

Action Item #2. Arlene reported this item has been completed. The Commissioners should have received an email on April 12, 2006 of all legislation mentioned earlier.

Action Item #3. Arlene reported this item was completed. Copies of the PM Common Methodology v1.0 have been sent to Senator Groff.

Action Item #4. Arlene reported this item has been completed. There is a 5th page on this month's dashboard, with all pertinent acronyms. Next month there will be another page with descriptions of each project.

Action Item #5. Arlene reported this item is completed.

Action Item #6. Arlene reported this item is completed.

Action Item #7. Arlene reported this item is in progress and will get an update by the *genesis* staff later on.

Action Item #8. Arlene reported this item was completed at the March IMC.

Action Item #9. Arlene reported this item has been closed. Chairman Picanso will provide an update on the current status of the annual report.

Chairman Picanso noted that the annual report is still in progress and hopes to provide a new version to the Commission at next month's meeting.

II. Old Business

A. Projects Readouts (Arlene Booker, OIT Staff)
1. IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report

Arlene Booker provided the Commission with a brief review of the IMC Monthly Project Dashboard. She noted out the CDOT ERP did deploy Phase I on April 3rd, 2006- the human resources component. They are working on Phase II. Things are going well and they will provide an update on lessons learned and future progress. Also, the project did deploy as scheduled.

a.) Colorado Department of Personnel and Administration (CDPA-DoIT) – Email Consolidation Project
Rick Malinowski, CIO, Guy Mellor, Project Manager

Arlene called forward and introduced the Email project team. Guy Mellor mentioned that the baseline survey and status of contract with Microsoft would be the topics of discussion. Guy mentioned that the Commissioners should have received a copy of the aggregated survey as well as a Power Point presentation in their packets. First, Guy Mellor introduced the project team, made up entirely of state resources. He noted that in the last 60 days, OIT/DPA employees have put in 800 person hours. Further, Jill Elgren is responsible for the appearance and success of the survey- on loan from Jeff Wells. Odd Pedersen, loaned by OIT, performed much of the math and calculations and, should the project proceed, he will act as project manager. Matt Moynahan is a member of the server team who will act as technical lead. He also introduced Karen Cantrell as DPA program manager.

Guy Mellor briefly discussed the Power Point slides with the Commission, mentioning that they had drawn a baseline to determine existing systems. Guy noted that all executive branch CIO's had comprehensively completed the survey within 45 days, which he was quite pleased with. Also, the Public Defender, Secretary of State and Treasurers office participated. They found that there are just under 27,000 email boxes and that roughly 16 million emails are sent and received each month.

Commissioner Delmonico asked what the number of employees in the state is. Guy Mellor responded that the State number is around 36,000 employees.

Guy Mellor noted that there are 211 email servers. For practical purposes, there are 51 servers that can be worked with in the consolidation effort and that they should be able to go from 51 to 12-18- a 67% decrease. Of the 16 million emails each months, about 40% are spam. There are also currently 26 different applications for virus/spam protection.

Representative Pommer asked what the typical company offers as far as email space for users? Mark Weatherford, CISO, responded that the standard user has 50 megabytes. Though, a researcher may have more. Also, he noted that it would reduce the cost of the box to keep it cleaned out.

Representative Coleman questioned how often an inquiry into a past email might be required and by what vehicle? Guy Mellor announced that 10% of respondents noted that they have legal requirements to save email. Representative Coleman then asked that, since we have been so trained to back up all of our files, how would we go about doing so in the best way here? Guy Mellor responded that, in Colorado, we can store either on the computer's hard drive or on the server. Email is just one kind of storage on the desktop.

Guy Mellor noted that the State is currently paying an average of $6.61 per mailbox versus the $8-$12 stated in Gartner research. Currently, we are paying less than the private sector for our email. Commissioner Mulford responded that, while we may be paying less, our functionality might be less as well.

Commissioner McGimpsey asked if the consolidation would improve the communications within the state? Guy Mellor responded that, currently, the Governor has no way to send a single email out to every state employee in the event of an emergency, so by consolidating it would improve communications.

Guy Mellor further stated that the contract with Microsoft has been signed. Also, on May 2, 2006 the kickoff meeting for Phase I will be held. This phase will last for 60 days and will have two deliverables: a detailed architectural design of what the system should look like technically, and a cost estimate. Then they will return to the Governor's Office and ask for a "go/no go" decision. If the decision is made to go, the Request for Proposal (RFP) will be completed over the summer and hopefully by next fall, the contract will be signed.

Commissioner Mulford noted that the team has done an outstanding job of studying the baseline. The cooperation has been great, as has the outcome. He further pointed out that while it may not initially save dollars, it will certainly be beneficial in the future, as the potential for cost growth in the future is great.

b.) Department of Revenue (CDOR) – CSTARS Project
  Brett Mueller, CIO

Brett Mueller, CIO Department of Revenue, provided an update on the CSTARS Project. Brett Mueller first mentioned to the Commission that the CFO of the department is also available to answer questions. Mueller stated that the current system is rather cumbersome and the upgrade is expected to provide significant benefit to county and state users as well as taxpayers and customers at the counters. The project is in its final testing phases and deployment is expected this spring, with a hard date yet to be determined. Fairly aggressive testing and training has ensued, to the benefit of the counties so they can delve into and refine the application prior to launch. It is estimated that the project is within weeks of launch and they expect all counties to be deployed in this calendar year. Also, the department has completed the 2nd contract amendment with the vendor, which has been approved by the State Controller's Office. At the request of the county users, the Department also undertook 3 additional super-user (train the trainer) training sessions.

Commissioner Mulford asked what the primary drivers have been in the delays with deployment. Brett Mueller responded that the delays have come from two sources- the application itself and the data migration. He noted that the department had found a few defects that needed to be fixed or regressed fully. Also, the vendor is still working on the data migration.

c.) Department of Labor and Employment (CDLE) – *genesis* Project
  Steve Uretsky, CIO and Wayne Peeler, Budget Director

Wayne Peeler announced that the first supplemental was heard by the JBC on March 15, 2006, which is currently an add-on to the supplemental 06-07 Long Bill and is expected to be sent to the Governor shortly, if it has not been already. The 2nd part, which concerns the actual project assessment, was presented to the JBC on April 13, 2006. The JBC approved a portion of the request, $500k, to get the project started. This should also have been added as an add-on to the Long Bill. The remainder of the money for the recovery assessment has not yet been approved.

Chairman Picanso asked if the $500k was part of the $2.3 million asked for and wanted verification that the JBC is waiting to act on the other portion of the request. Wayne Peeler verified that that is in fact the current status.

Representative Coleman asked if the first supplemental was for FY 06-07? Wayne Peeler responded that the first supplemental, having to do with programmatic costs, was a supplemental for FY 05-06 and an add-on to the current Long Bill.

d.) Department of State (CDOS) – SCORE Project
  Brian Mouty- Project Manager, Trevor Timmons- Deputy CIO, Scott Lee-IVV
  Vendor, Brian Balay-CIO

Brian Mouty noted that the SCORE project has moved its reporting with the Department of State from the election division to the IT division. He noted that the IT division is also working on the e-FOR^{3}T project. As a result, the responsibilities of the reporting have been split-Brian Balay will oversee the e-FOR^{3}T project and Trevor Timmons will be working on SCORE.

Trevor Timmons noted that they are currently in negotiations with the Department of Justice (DOJ). It's the voting rights section of the Civil Rights Division of the US DOJ that is assigned enforcement responsibility for the federal Help America Vote Act with respect to voter registration, provisional voting, etc. The federal deadline was January 1, 2006, which Colorado is not currently in compliance with. However, they are currently speaking with representatives from the DOJ as they are attempting to move into compliance. The DOJ is looking at the provision of accessible equipment, voter eligibility and voter lists.

Timmons noted that there are four separate requirements, some of which Colorado is in compliance with: counties must take action when there are duplicate registrations in the same state; it has to do with voter verification. Colorado is currently providing information to counties regarding duplicate registrations. County clerks are also involved in the process in order to maintain a greater level of communication.

Brian Mouty discussed the current status of the RFP and announced that the evaluation team met for a full day last Friday to discuss the RFP and the schedule. Both were approved. Some of the changes made since the last RFP process: the number of evaluation team members increased from 11 to 12, the composition changed from 6 county persons and 5 state, to 8 county and 4 state. It also now includes a member from the Office of Innovation and Technology, Elain Radford. Brian Mouty asked if she had any comments on the meeting last week. Elain responded that she was impressed with their disciplined and rigorous process.

Brian Mouty noted that, since the last RFP went out for bid, the qualifications have changed as well as the market. He noted that the vendors must now have worked in at least 2 states, there is improved security and testing, and more tangible milestones. Further, with regard to the RFP, they have increased the amount of information received from the vendors. He noted that the RFP was posted on Tuesday, April 18, 2006 and the deadline for proposal response is May 9, 2006. The target date for the intent to award is July 14, 2006.

Trevor Timmons noted that they understand that the DOJ may impose requirements on Colorado that could impact the RFP and the dates surrounding it. There has been a change in the project management in the Secretary of State's Office. Further, Brian Mouty is only under contract until the end of June, but they have made a selection and are currently negotiating a contract with the new project manager. They have also amended the contract to extend the IV&V vendor through the RFP process and intend to extend the contract for a further period beyond the fiscal year.

Commissioner McGimpsey asked if they would have to redo the RFP if the DOJ changes the requirements. Trevor Timmons responded that it is difficult to tell at this stage. They are working with states that have different requirements and it depends upon the focus of the DOJ and how they may request changes in the environment in Colorado.

Commissioner Monkman asked if there are states that are in full compliance already. Trevor Timmons responded that there are quite a few that are in compliance. As of right now, 13 states are not in compliance.

Commissioner Monkman further asked if the DOJ has threatened sanctions. Trevor Timmons responded that the DOJ has not threatened to pull back any federal money, however, if a state

is not moving forward in a way that is unacceptable to the DOJ, they will have to go to court and a decision will be returned in 7-10 days.

Representative Coleman stated her concern that the project has not changed a great deal from what it was last year when it was stopped. She would like to see that there's a paper trail. Also, where are we in meeting the demands required of us? She wants to make sure that, while we have an aggressive schedule, we don't have a poor system. She also expressed concern for the way that provisional ballots have been handled in the past.

Brian Mouty responded that there are two issues that are considered with elections: tabulation and registration. The two issues are treated separately. Trevor Timmons previously noted that we are doing well with tabulation. We are using the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). There is equipment available for purchase for the counties. They are getting systems that are compliant with the 2002 standards to address a paper trail and additional security addressed in 2002. Goal was to get vendor identified early and get the project rolled out to pilot counties for the November 2007 election.

Representative Coleman then mentioned that, with regard to the pilot program, if there is ever an opportunity to invite some legislators, it would be beneficial. This is one way to better educate them.

Trevor Timmons noted that, at the current time, the focus is on the tabulation of voting. They want to be sure that the intent of a provisional ballot is not to let just anyone cast a vote. The point is that if someone shows up to a polling location, they can cast a vote even if they can't verify the person at that time. Verification begins with voter lists. For those who are not eligible to vote, however, their votes will not count.

Representative Coleman noted that they were under the impression that, with respect to provisional balloting, if someone voted in Summit County who was registered elsewhere, that vote wouldn't count. She is concerned that the technology is not being utilized as it should be.

Commissioner Monkman asked how many vendors had bid on the original project and when the bids do come in, are there enough provisions that the department would be able to say no rather than settling for inadequacy. Brian Mouty responded that there were 12 vendors in the original bid. Right now they are projecting that 6 vendors will likely qualify. Also, he noted that the evaluation team that is charged with making the decision and will assess the qualifications from a business perspective. They also have the right to cancel a bid at anytime and resubmit. So, if there are three proposals and none are right, they can change the requirements and keep looking. However, because there are other states with successful projects, they are hopeful that there are capable vendors out there.

Trevor Timmons responded to Representative Coleman's discussion of the provisional ballots and noted that it is accurate that if you cast a provisional ballot in a different county, it will not count. However, this is a policy issue that is up to policymakers to determine in the future.

Commissioner Delmonico would like it stated on the record that her company is bidding on the project, though they are not privy to any information other than what has been discussed today.

Commissioner Pommer added that he was frustrated that, for people who live in one county and work in another, it is too difficult to leave work in the middle of the day to go home and vote. They should be able to vote in a different county. No further discussion followed and Chairman Picanso asked if there was any IV&V to report. There was none.

Chairman Picanso then provided an update on the status of IMC Annual Report. He noted Commissioner Lutz's previous request to have the tri-fold summary report show a few changes. Chairman Picanso and Commissioner Lutz determined together that there should be a more extensive document that looks more like a corporate annual report. There are currently 10-12 pages. The document is currently being worked on internally but OIT would like to get it finalized and emailed for the Commissioners review by the next meeting.

Action Item	(Chairman Picanso)

Provide Commissioners with updated IMC Annual Report for the May IMC Meeting.

Chairman Picanso noted that the report was due last month, as last year the legislature had asked OIT to present a short annual report to them. However, since this year it was decided to do a deeper report, being that it was a year of transition and there is quite a bit to discuss as far as projects, contracts, project management, etc. that the document would be delayed. If there are any questions about the report please contact Chairman Picanso.

III. New Business

A. Annual IT Planning Process
Arlene Booker, OIT Staff

Arlene briefly discussed the components of the annual Department IT Plans (DITP's). As part of the statutory requirement, agencies are required to annually submit their department IT plans. The first part is an overview, a capstone of what they will be focusing on. This year, in the Capstone, OIT is expecting to see how departments plan to align with the State IT Strategic Plan i.e. cyber security, the Portal, and common and shared services. Arlene noted that Chairman Picanso would very much like to focus on the initiatives of the strategic plan in the DITP's. Arlene went on to say that the 2nd component seeks information on architecture, whether or not they're in compliance with State standards, all human and hardware resources, and what they will be preparing in the upcoming fiscal year. She further noted that there was very good participation at the April 5, 2006 training session.

Chairman Picanso added that he feels OIT was responsive to the changes that needed to be made in the forms and the process itself. OIT is trying to accommodate the CIOs' calendars as well. Because OIT is collecting a lot of information in a limited time so they have taken out some of the questions that were not as valuable last year. Further, he discussed the application and how the forms will be used-to evaluate the planning process, review budget requests, analyze project proposals and procurement requests. There is less focus on the amount of data and more on data that is accurate.

Arlene further noted that OIT has given agencies more time in the front end to complete the DITP's and more time in the back end to spread out the agency visits. They have allotted 60 days for each versus the 2-4 weeks from last year.

Commissioner Delmonico stated that it is important to note how much participation and cooperation has increased within the CIO forum recently. She would like this passed on to the CIO's to let them know that the IMC feels that this is a positive change. She would like to know from the CIO's if they feel that things are better lately than they have been in the past.

Chairman Picanso noted how we will utilize the data: see if the DITP's align with the IT Strategic Plan and if the decision items align with the DITP's. He further stated that, with regards to the Strategic Plan timeline, to this point all of the deadlines have been met.

Commissioner Monkman wanted to make everyone aware that, regarding the annual budget process, OSPB and OIT will be working together, however there will be a scaled down process at OSPB due to anticipation of staff moving on to other positions. As a result, some of the scheduling may be off.

Chairman Picanso responded that he was aware that things may change a bit and have refocused accordingly. Chairman Picanso made note to contact OSPB.

Action Item	(Chairman Picanso)

OIT contact OSPB to discuss the timeline on the annual Budget Process

Commissioner Mulford asked if OIT was factoring the passage of SB-149 into the planning process. Chairman Picanso responded that, if the legislation were to move quickly OIT would have to re-architect the office with respect to duties and responsibilities, however, the timeline shouldn't change. Further, if SB-063 passes, it would add three additional FTE to OIT but they would be strictly devoted to project management.

IV. Subcommittee Readouts

A. Enterprise Architecture (EA) Subcommittee

Commissioner Mulford reported that the EA subcommittee met this morning and there were three major items to discuss: the Email Consolidation Project, Disaster Recovery e-FOR[3]T which is going well and expected to open this summer, and the status of the action items in the IT Strategic Plan. There has been good progress overall; they spoke with Mark Weatherford last month on the status of the security items. While some dates in the plan have been moved, they are actionable items and there has been good progress overall. He further pointed out that OIT has created a dashboard to track the items and that other states are interested in using a similar system. He feels that OIT/IMC have taken a pragmatic approach and laying out good actionable items that will provide cost savings in the long term and improved employee satisfaction.

B. IT Risk Management Subcommittee

Commissioner Delmonico reported that the IT Risk Management Subcommittee met this morning and discussed much of what has already been discussed at the full IMC meeting.

However, they are planning on scheduling a separate subcommittee meeting to come up with a list of questions for projects because they always ask the same questions. And, hopefully they can get a list together to let the CIO's know what kind of questions they'll be asked.

C. Policy / Portfolio Subcommittees

Representative Coleman reported that the Policy Subcommittee met jointly with the Portfolio Subcommittee and discussed the four bills going to the legislature. She is confident that the bills will pass. SB-149 is on its way to the House right now. She hopes the cyber security bill will pass as well. Further, she feels that increased discussion about it will help. She also discussed that the model IT contracts are heading to the State Controller for their opinion regarding required agency use.

Commissioner Delmonico noted that she and Commissioner Mulford would be happy to come over and talk about the bills if needed. Also, she has some suggestions and additions to add to the contracts before they go to the Attorney General's Office. She further noted that they had previously discussed getting a vendor/consultant to review the contracts and wondered if that had happened. Representative Coleman responded that with SB-63 and 64 it should help with substantive structure of this issue.

Commissioner Delmonico also wanted to bring up the issue of a way to determine past vendor performance not only within Colorado but other states as well before they are hired. She wondered if they would take into account vendor performance in other states' projects. Representative Coleman said that she would assume they would receive all of the vendor's history but she will make sure.

Chairman Picanso provided an update on the current status of the IT contract templates. He noted that he had a meeting with the State Controller yesterday, they have been sent over to the Attorney General's Office and that they should be finalized in the next few days with few changes. The State Controller hopes to incorporate them into policies and issue a letter to the executive directors to utilize the contracts. If they are utilized and the contracts go unchanged, it should go more smoothly for the agencies with future projects since there is already a favorable opinion from the Controller. If there are any language changes they may need to revisit those on an annual or semi-annual basis.

Commissioner Delmonico feels that this will definitely need to happen since they have already found some changes that need to be made. Representative Coleman noted that this would likely come up in the agenda down the line.

Chairman Picanso asked if there was any further discussion. No discussion ensued.

Adjournment
Chairman Picanso adjourned the meeting at 3:35 pm.

_____

The next IMC will be held on:
Friday, May 19, 2006
Legislative Services Building – Hearing Room A
200 E. 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203